

REMARKS

Claim 1-35 are pending. The Office Action, dated July 24, 2007, has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 10, 15, 20, 23, 24, 27, and 29 have been amended in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection of Claims 1, 10, and 27 under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 10, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that Claims 1, 10, and 27 are “unclear how the detection of modification to encrypted data is done?”

Rejected independent Claims 1, 10, and 27 as now amended more particularly recite one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention. Claim 1 now recites the following:

A system for transferring electronic medical files comprising:
a record encapsulation system configured to encapsulate a medical record data file,
wherein encapsulating a medical record data file comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the medical record data file, such that modifications to the medical record data file are detected; and
a record server configured to encrypt the encapsulated medical record data file and transmit the encrypted, encapsulated medical record data file to a record client.

Claim 10 now recites the following:

A method for transferring electronic medical files comprising:
encapsulating medical record data, **wherein encapsulating medical record data comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the medical record data, such that modifications to the medical record data are detected;**
assembling the medical record data into a medical record data file;
receiving a request to transfer the medical record data file;
encrypting the medical record data; and
transferring the medical record data file to a remote location.

Claim 27 now recites the following:

A method for transferring electronic medical record data comprising:
extracting an excerpt of the electronic medical record data from an electronic medical record data file at a first location;
transmitting the excerpt to a remote location;
encapsulating comment data, wherein encapsulating comment data comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the comment data, such that modifications to the comment data are detected; and
receiving encapsulated comment data associated with the excerpt.

Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0036] of the Application as originally filed. In light of the Amendment submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-9 and 31-32 under 35 USC § 103

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”).

Rejected independent Claim 1, as now amended, more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, wherein Claim 1 now recites the following:

A system for transferring electronic medical files comprising:
a record encapsulation system configured to encapsulate a medical record data file,
wherein encapsulating a medical record data file comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the medical record data file, such that modifications to the medical record data file are detected; and
a record server configured to encrypt the encapsulated medical record data file and transmit the encrypted, encapsulated medical record data file to a record client.

(emphasis added). Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0036] of the Application as originally filed. In the Office Action the Examiner stated that “[f]or examination purposes the Examiner has treated [how the detection of modification to encrypted data

is done] as encrypting a medical record data file.” Encapsulating the medical record data file, as used in the application, is not the same as encrypting the medical record data file. Encryption, as used in paragraph [0025] of the Application as originally filed, may be used to “**prevent** access to medical records except through record server 102 and record client 104a.” (emphasis added)

Encapsulation, as used in paragraphs [0036] and [0038] of the Application as originally filed, may be used to detect modifications to medical records. Paragraph [0036] states: “record encapsulation system 302 includes encryption algorithms that generate a value based upon the exact data structure of the entire medical record data file, such that any modifications to the medical record data file can be **detected**.” (emphasis added) Paragraph [0038] states: “detail encapsulation system 304 can encapsulate graphic image data, x-ray data, sonogram data, and other suitable data so that inadvertent modification of such data is not performed. Likewise, detail encapsulation system 304 can buffer detail data and **detect** whether any changes have been made, such as through a suitable encryption algorithm.”

While the Application does state that encryption algorithms may be used in the encapsulation process, it further states that the encryption algorithms would be used to generate a value based on the data structure of the medical record data file, such that any modifications to the medical record data file are detected. Nichols does not teach use of encryption algorithms such that a person who decrypts the medical record data file cannot modify the file without the modifications being detected. Accordingly, Nichols does not teach generating a value based upon the exact data structure of the medical record data file to detect modifications of the data file.

Instead, Nichols discloses data encryption of medical records such that the records cannot be read while being transmitted. Nichols is concerned with protecting the confidentiality of medical records while the records are transmitted between a data center and a programmer. *See* Nichols,

column 2, lines 27-29; column 7, lines 55-60. Nichols is not concerned with detecting modifications to those records while the records are maintained in a collection of medical records, as the present invention is. Therefore, Nichols does not disclose detecting modifications to medical records when those records are not in transit. In other words, if a medical record in the Nichols invention were transmitted from a data center to a programmer, modified by the programmer, and then transmitted from the programmer back to the data center, the data center would not have a means of detecting the modification.

Evans was not relied on by the Examiner for detection of data modification, and Evans does not teach, suggest, or disclose detection of data modification. Thus, the combination of Evans and Nichols suggested by the Examiner would not include detection of data modification.

In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”). However, Claims 2-9 and 31-32 depend from and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 1 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 2-9 and 31-32 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Further, Claim 4 includes the limitation that “the record client further comprises a tracking system configured to update a tracking record when the medical record data file is accessed.” The Examiner stated that “[t]his limitation is met by the [Evans] electronic medical record system which updates patient’s records upon a nurses or physician entry of information into the system (see: column 5, lines 29-40).” The entry of information into the Evans system is not equivalent to an

access of a medical record data file. The Evans system may allow a healthcare provider to modify a medical record data file, but this function would not track when the medical record data file is accessed. For instance, a healthcare provider could access the medical record data file but not modify it, and the Evans system would not track this access.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claims 2-9 and 31-32 also be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 10-15 and 33 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”).

Rejected independent Claim 10 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, wherein Claim 10 now recites the following:

A method for transferring electronic medical files comprising:
encapsulating medical record data, wherein encapsulating medical record data **comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the medical record data, such that modifications to the medical record data are detected;**
assembling the medical record data into a medical record data file;
receiving a request to transfer the medical record data file;
encrypting the medical record data; and
transferring the medical record data file to a remote location.

(emphasis added). Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0036] of the Application as originally filed.

Similar to Claim 1, Claim 10 includes the limitation that encapsulating medical record data comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the medical record data file, such that modifications to the medical record data file are detected. The distinction between encapsulation comprising detection of data modification and encryption is discussed in the remarks regarding

Claim 1 and incorporated herein. The combination of Evans and Nichols suggested by the Examiner would not include detection of data modification.

In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 11-15 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”). However, Claims 11-15 and 33 depend from and further limit Claim 10. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 10 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 11-15 and 33 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Further, Claim 15 has been amended so that the limitation regarding encapsulation therein matches limitations regarding encapsulation in the other claims. Claim 15 now recites the following:

receiving medical record data at the remote location;
encapsulating the medical record data, **wherein encapsulating the medical record data comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the medical record data, such that modifications to the medical record data are detected;** and
updating the medical record data file to include the medical record data.

(emphasis added). Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0036] of the Application as originally filed. The distinction between encapsulation comprising detection of data modification and encryption is discussed in the remarks regarding Claim 1 and incorporated herein. The combination of Evans and Nichols suggested by the Examiner would not include detection of data modification.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claims 11-15 and 33 also be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 23 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”).

Rejected independent Claim 23 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, wherein Claim 23 now recites the following:

A system for transferring electronic medical files comprising:
a record server having a medical record data file, **the record server configured to generate a value based on the data structure of the medical record data file, such that modifications to the medical record data file are detected;**
a sync system configured to verify that a record client has received sync data before transferring the medical record data file; and
a record client coupled to the record server, the record client comprising a tracking system configured to update a tracking record when the medical record data file is accessed.

(emphasis added). Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0036] of the Application as originally filed. The distinction between encapsulation comprising detection of data modification and encryption is discussed in the remarks regarding Claim 1 and incorporated herein. The combination of Evans and Nichols suggested by the Examiner would not include detection of data modification.

Further, Claim 23 includes the limitation of “the record client comprising a tracking system configured to update a tracking record when the medical record data file is accessed.” The Examiner stated that “Evans further teaches tracking and description of patient data within the system (see: column 9, lines 27-37).” The cited portion of Evans refers to tracking the location of patient data within the Evans system, such as whether the data is within the data archive or data cache. Evans column 9, lines 15-37. Evans does not disclose a tracking system configured to update a tracking record when the medical record data file is accessed.

Additionally, Evans column 5, lines 29-40, cited in the Office Action as disclosing a similar limitation in Claim 4 does not disclose a tracking system configured to update a tracking record when the medical record data file is accessed. The distinction between recording when a medical record data file is accessed and recording modifications to a medical record data file is discussed in the remarks regarding Claim 4 and incorporated herein.

In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 24-26 under 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”).

It is well settled that to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131. Moreover, in order for a reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim” and “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989) and *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection does not satisfy these requirements.

Rejected independent Claim 24 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, wherein Claim 24 now recites the following:

A method for transferring electronic medical data comprising:
determining whether a patient file having a predetermined patient data structure exists for a patient on a remote system;

creating the patient file with the predetermined patient data structure on the remote system if the patient file does not exist on the remote system; transferring the electronic medical data to the patient file on the remote system; and **encapsulating the patient file, wherein encapsulating the patient file comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the patient file, such that modifications to the patient file are detected.**

(emphasis added). Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0036] of the Application as originally filed. Evans does not teach, disclose, or suggest encapsulating the patient file, wherein encapsulating the patient file comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the medical record data file, such that modifications to the medical record data file are detected.

In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”). However, Claims 25-26 depend from and further limit Claim 24. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 24 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 25-26 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claims 25-26 also be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 27-28 under 35 USC § 103

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”).

Rejected independent Claim 27 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, wherein Claim 27 now recites the following:

A method for transferring electronic medical record data comprising:
extracting an excerpt of the electronic medical record data from an electronic medical record data file at a first location;
transmitting the excerpt to a remote location;
encapsulating comment data, wherein encapsulating comment data comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the comment data, such that modifications to the comment data are detected; and
receiving encapsulated comment data associated with the excerpt.

(emphasis added). Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0036] of the Application as originally filed. The distinction between encapsulation comprising detection of data modification and encryption is discussed in the remarks regarding Claim 1 and incorporated herein. The combination of Evans and Nichols suggested by the Examiner would not include detection of data modification.

In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”). However, Claim 28 depends from and further limits Claim 27. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 27 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 28 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Further, Claim 28 contains the limitation “extracting an excerpt of the electronic medical record data from the electronic medical record data file comprises removing user-readable patient

identifying data.” The Examiner stated with reference to Nichols that “[t]he Examiner considers the encrypting of patient records to include removing user readable patient identifying data to protect confidentiality of patient’s medical information.” Encryption, as disclosed in Nichols, does not include removing data.

Nichols uses encryption to protect the confidentiality of medical information during transmission of the medical information. Nichols, column 15, lines 54-60. In particular, Nichols states that “[b]efore sensitive information 221 is transmitted across data communication media 226, sensitive information 221 is encrypted by encryption engine 230.” Nichols, column 15, lines 9-11. Nichols later states that “[a]fter sensitive information 221 has been encrypted, the encrypted sensitive information is transmitted to remote data center 224 via data communications media 226.” Nichols, column 15, lines 47-49. Nichols states that “Decryption engine 234 . . . decrypts the encrypted sensitive information . . .” Nichols, column 15, lines 64-66. Finally, Nichols states “[t]he output of decryption engine 234 is the **original**, unencrypted sensitive information 221.” (emphasis added) Nichols, column 16, lines 2-4. Therefore, the encryption process disclosed in Nichols does not include a discussion of removing data, because the information that is decrypted is the original information that was encrypted.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claim 28 also be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 29-30 under 35 USC § 103

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”).

Rejected independent Claim 29 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, wherein Claim 29 now recites the following:

A method for transferring electronic medical record data comprising:
encapsulating an electronic medical record file, **wherein encapsulating an electronic medical record file comprises generating a value based on the data structure of the medical record data file, such that modifications to the medical record data file are detected;**
encrypting the encapsulated electronic medical record file;
transmitting the encrypted encapsulated electronic medical record file to a remote location; and
generating a display using the encapsulated electronic medical record file.

(emphasis added). Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0036] of the Application as originally filed. The distinction between encapsulation comprising detection of data modification and encryption is discussed in the remarks regarding Claim 1 and incorporated herein. The combination of Evans and Nichols suggested by the Examiner would not include detection of data modification.

In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”). However, Claim 30 depends from and further limits Claim 29. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 29 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 30 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 30 also be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 16-19 and 34-35 under 35 USC § 103

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,305,377 to Portwood (“Portwood”).

Rejected independent Claim 16 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, wherein Claim 16 now recites the following:

A system for distributing packaged medical supplies comprising:
a record server configured to transmit medical supply package data to a record client and to correlate the package data with verification data received from the record client;
wherein the medical supply package data identifies an at least one physical package of medical supplies.

(emphasis added). Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0068] of the Application as originally filed. In the Office Action the Examiner stated that “Portwood et al. teach a prescription distribution system including a server computer communicating with other prescriber computer to transfer prescription data to the server for validation, certification, and distribution (see: abstract, column 3, lines 43-49 and column 7, lines 35-37). It is respectfully submitted that prescriptions are a form of ‘medical supplies’.” Claim 16 as amended includes the limitation of “wherein the medical supply package data identifies an at least one physical package of medical supplies.” As stated in the Office Action, Portwood deals with prescription data, not physical packages, regardless of whether prescriptions are a form of medical supplies. Thus, the combination of Evans and Portwood suggested by the Examiner would not include a record server configured to transmit medical supply package data to a record client and to correlate the package data with verification data received from the record client; wherein the medical supply package data identifies an at least one physical package of medical supplies.

In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 17, 19, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,305,377 to Portwood (“Portwood”). However, Claims 17, 19, and 35 depend from and further limit Claim 16. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 16 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 17, 19, and 35 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Further, Claim 35 includes the limitation of “an image capture device configured to generate image data, and wherein the verification data comprises the image data.” The Office Action states that this limitation is met by the data source of Evans. However, the data source of Evans is included in the legacy data system. Evans, column 12, lines 37-38. The legacy data system uses the data source to convert legacy paper records into electronic records. Evans, column 12, lines 41-44. The verification data of the present invention is used for correlation with package data. Thus, the verification data would not comprise legacy data. Therefore, the data source of Evans would not generate image data that the verification data comprises.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claims 17, 19, and 35 also be withdrawn.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”), U.S. Patent No. 6,305,377 to Portwood (“Portwood”), and U.S. Patent No. 7,039,810 to Nichols (“Nichols”). However, Claim 18 depends from and further limits Claim 16. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 16 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 18 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 18 also be withdrawn.

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”), U.S. Patent No. 6,305,377 to Portwood (“Portwood”), and U.S.

Patent No. 6,370,841 to Chudy (“Chudy”). However, Claim 34 depends from and further limits Claim 16. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 16 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 34 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 34 also be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 20-22 under 35 USC § 103

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,305,377 to Portwood (“Portwood”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”).

Rejected independent Claim 20 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, wherein Claim 20 now recites the following:

A method for distributing packaged medical supplies comprising:
storing package data corresponding to a **physical** package of medical supplies;
transmitting the **physical** package to a remote site;
receiving the package data from the remote site; and
authorizing release of the **physical** package if the stored package data matches the received package data.

(emphasis added). Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in paragraph [0068] of the Application as originally filed. As amended, Claim 20 clearly indicates that the package of medical supplies is a physical package, not merely data. The Office Action states “the claimed storing package data corresponding to a sealed package of medical supplies is met by the data storage unit use to store patient data including prescription data (see: column 2, lines 60-66).” However, prescription data does not correspond to a physical package of medical supplies. Prescription data would identify medication, but not a physical package of medical supplies as included in the claim limitation. The Office Action further states “the claimed transmitting the sealed package to a remote site is met by the prescription distribution system that enable quicker

delivery of prescription at the patient's location (see: abstract and column 5, lines 7-10).” Portwood's description of the prescription distribution system does not include functionality to receive a physical package. Portwood, column 6, lines 13-23. Embodiments of the prescription distribution system are described as including electronic components, such as a modem, CPU, printer, and CRT monitor. Portwood, column 6, lines 13-23. The prescription distribution system is described as receiving prescription information. Portwood, column 6, lines 14-15.

In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,305,377 to Portwood (“Portwood”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074 to Evans (“Evans”).

However, Claims 21-22 depend from and further limit Claim 20. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 20 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 21-22 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent 21-22 also be withdrawn.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 1-35.

Applicants hereby request an extension of time for making this reply and hereby authorize the Director to charge the required fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP. Applicants do not believe that any other fees are due; however, in the event that any other fees are due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: November 24, 2008
CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Gregory W. Carr/
Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093